THEOLOGY

VOL. LXIII NOVEMBER, 1960 No. 485

Editorial

IT is fitting that in the fourth centenary year of the Reformation in Scotland a new Scottish church history should be published, and doubly fitting that it should be produced by the present Moderator of the General Assembly, Dr J. H. S. Burleigh, Principal of New College, Edinburgh, and Professor of Ecclesiastical History. *A Church History of Scotland* (Oxford University Press, 42s.) is a one-volume work, designed for the general reader. It does not attempt to break new ground, nor is it furnished with documentation. But it is obviously the outcome of a long-standing familiarity with the records of Christianity in Scotland from its earliest days. All in all, it is an extremely tangled piece of ecclesiastical history, and in its opening period compassed about with much obscurity. But Dr Burleigh threads his way through the story with unfailing skill and with a remarkable dispassionateness. It was said of William Robertson, the famous eighteenth-century Scottish historian, that "he contrived to avoid partisanship so successfully that he may be said to have taken all the colour out of the picture". Dr Burleigh deserves the encomium but not the qualification of it. It is notoriously difficult for anyone to do equal justice to the Auld Kirk and to the Free Church in the nineteenth century, but Dr Burleigh contrives to avoid partisanship so successfully that we had to consult *Who's Who* in order to discover where he belonged before the union of 1929. This is likely to be a standard work for some time to come, and it should receive as warm a welcome in England as in Scotland.

* * * * *

There is still a great deal of historical work to be done on the reaction of the Churches to the onset and effects of the industrial revolution in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Particularly is this so in Scotland, where it has been a curiously neglected area of study. Dr Stewart Mechie in his Cunningham Lectures on *The Church and Scottish Social Development* 1780–1870 (Oxford University Press, 25s.) has taken what may be described as a preliminary canter over the field, and his book is as good an introduction to the subject as we are likely to have until much more research has been carried out on what happened in different types of locality.

The general conclusion that emerges so far is that in Scotland, as in other countries, while the official Church was all too little aware of what was going on in its midst or under its nose, yet there was more social concern on the part of Christian individuals and groups about the evils of pauperism than has commonly been supposed. A name that stands out is that of Dr Thomas Chalmers, but his record in this connexion is ambivalent. For although by his teaching and

actions he did much to give men a social conscience, he was himself so dominated by malthusian, *laissez faire* and paternalistic conceptions that the remedies he espoused and sought to enact were gravely inadequate, not to say misleading. If the enthusiasm that went into the witness of the Free Church had been harnessed to social prophecy and a realistic program of reform, Scottish Christianity might have given a noble example to other Churches. As it was, in his opening speech as Moderator of the first Free Church Assembly in 1843, Chalmers declared that they had an utter absence of sympathy with "the demagogues and agitators of the day". It was the day of Chartism.

It is significant that the minister in the Church of Scotland who at the time of the Disruption was most perceptive and outspoken about the will of God for social justice did not throw in his lot with the Free Church. This was the Rev. Patrick Brewster of Paisley—a Scottish Stewart Headlam—who by reason of his association with the Chartists and his forthright preaching was attacked in the church courts and had to appear before the General Assembly as a revolutionary, but he gave better than he got. He decided in 1843 to remain in the Established Church because he reckoned he would be more free there than in the Free Church to fight for "the civil rights of a suffering and oppressed people". The true Headship of the Redeemer, of which the Fathers of the Disruption talked so much, meant that obedience to God's law in all the affairs of this life, and its supremacy over every other law, must be preached—"and not some subordinate matter respecting the election of ministers".

But the Free Church too had its social reformers, notably and surprisingly Dr James Begg. Begg, whom Dr Burleigh curiously does not even mention, usually appears in Scottish church history in anything but a favourable light—as the leader of the die-hard opposition to union with the United Presbyterians and to the Higher Criticism in the Robertson Smith case. But he had been, and indeed still was, a powerful advocate of the interests of the working classes, especially of the provision of tolerable housing. Moreover, he realized that government action alone could meet the situation. "Human selfishness and prejudice," he said, "had always been too strong for mere remonstrance, and it was only when public opinion had assumed such an authoritative and commanding power as to be embodied in the action of the government that . . . social evils had been forced to give way." Dr Mechie points out that if Begg had been killed, instead of only injured, in a railway accident in 1865, his name to-day would be held in high honour.

* * * * *

Any readers of THEOLOGY, who are willing to send on their copies to members of foreign churches, are invited to inform the General Secretary of the C. of E. Council on Inter-Church Relations at Palace Court, 222 Lambeth Road, S.E.1. Many inquiries come to that body from Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Old Catholics, Lutheran and Reformed sources, revealing a desire to read Anglican periodicals.

* * * * *

Autres temps autres moeurs.—"In the neighbourhood of London, the dissenters build booths on the Lord's-day to preach in, and afterwards take them down again on the same day, thus labouring on and profaning a day on which we are commanded to rest from our labours. But the ten commandments are not read in dissenting meeting-houses; and that one of them at least is not much regarded, their breaking the Sabbath indisputably proves."—*The Church Magazine*, August 1840, p. 239.

Letter from Scotland

To every nation its centenary; while some in England are recalling the glories of Anglicanism after the Restoration (see Dr Norman Sykes in *The Listener* for 26th May 1960) and others the inception of the Royal Society, Scotland this year celebrates the re-formation of its Kirk which centred on the year 1560. Several books have already appeared, and more are soon to follow, which deal with one aspect or another of this watershed in Scots history. The General Assembly of the Church of Scotland met in special session in October, and it may safely be said that the nation is aware that something is being celebrated which is of great importance to the life of Scotland. Many people, perhaps most, have only a vague idea of the significance of those events which are being recalled, although the Church of Scotland is doing a good deal to inform its own members of the issues which were at stake; a minority is certainly deploring rather than celebrating; but there is no doubt that for the country as a whole 1560 means more than does any corresponding date in English history. This would be true, if for no other reason, because much the largest of the minority churches in Scotland is the Roman Catholic, and the question of Protestant and Catholic is of theological, cultural, academic and athletic importance, especially in the West of Scotland.

There are many reasons why the Scottish Reformation has made so deep an impression on the whole life and spirit of the people. Most of them are to be found in a study of Scots history, and this is not the place to rehearse its complexities; something of these was set down by an Episcopalian author in the pages of THEOLOGY last year.[1] Many of them, however, are of first importance in relation to the still vexed question of Anglican-Presbyterian relations, and the purpose of the following paragraphs is to offer some comments on the situation in this year of Reformation celebrations, because the specific theological points at issue between Anglicans and Presbyterians are unlikely to be resolved until they are looked at afresh in the whole context, historical and otherwise, in which they have arisen.

It is not very long since Professor C. H. Dodd first introduced us to the distinction between theological and non-theological factors

[1] R. T. Halliday: "Anglican-Presbyterian Relations in Scotland", THEOLOGY, April 1959, pp. 141–7.

in the obstacles to church unity; perhaps the time has already come to reassess this distinction, and to realize that, valid and important as it is, it can become a hindrance rather than a help if it leads us to discuss the theological and the non-theological factors in isolation from one another. This is obviously true in the case of the long and tangled history of Presbyterian-Episcopalian differences in Scotland, the origins of which were in large measure due to political factors; it is true, in a more general sense, because the question of Church and State always has been and still is relevant to the question of church unity wherever Church and State are not completely separated from one another; and finally, it is true because non-theological factors must themselves be assessed and treated in a theological manner if they are to be seen in their real depth.

This can be illustrated by reference to one main political accompaniment of the Reformation in Scotland. The Reformation marked the end of three centuries of war with England, and the beginning of a period of alliance, followed rapidly by union of the crowns and a century later by union of the kingdoms. The centuries of intermittent warfare with England had been crude, bloody and for Church and nation alike simple and satisfying in their basic orientations (the bishops of Robert the Bruce's day were great nationalists, putting the claims of their king well before those of the Pope; and so it often was in the centuries which followed). The four hundred years since 1560 have been much more difficult for the small northern nation in so far as there has always been an undercurrent of resentment against union with a much more powerful neighbour—a union which the Scots have never been in the least able or indeed willing to abandon. This ambivalent relationship still to this day profoundly affects the Church. All this is of course a commonplace, and would not be worth mentioning were it not for the fact that all too often it is dismissed as of no importance, or regarded as a non-theological factor—which it is—and again dismissed. So when the Joint Report on Relations between Anglican and Presbyterian Churches appeared in 1957 it was only natural that a single proposal in the Report, that Bishops-in-Presbytery should be instituted in the Church of Scotland, was immediately decried as a piece of ecclesiastical and political imperialism from south of the border. This would have been the case to some extent even if there had been no campaign against bishops in certain sections of the Scottish press. It would also probably have been the case even if there had been a more vigorous handling of public relations, to make clear that the proposals were neither a cut-and-dried plan nor an ultimatum but merely a draft for prolonged consideration and discussion. It is not going to be easy to rescue the rest of the 1957 Report from the fate to which that single proposal was in some quarters consigned.

It is easy to point out, in reply to these fears, that the twentieth century is not the seventeenth, that we Scots have too long memories, and so forth; it is perhaps more important to treat these questions theologically. This will mean seeing the situation as both good and bad; good in so far as it has pleased God to put us in this particular

situation, from which we are meant to learn, and which as part of his providential ordering of history is good; bad in so far as it has been corrupted by selfishness, idleness and narrow-mindedness. We must ask then what is good in this situation; and a tentative answer to part of this question might be that God has set his children in families, large and small, so that they may learn to love one another out of their mutual differences and needs. The stronger, in loving the weaker, are required not to give offence by acting against the others' conscience (cp. Romans 14); to be sure, in doing this they must not act against their own conscience; but the freedom of the Christian means that on many matters he can "become as" those who differ from him without acting against his own conscience. For the purposes of the Apostolic Mission this even applied to a matter so central as the observance of the Jewish Law (cp. 1 Corinthians 9). We need not here ask which is the "strong" party in the Anglican-Presbyterian encounter and which the "weak"; each party has its "strengths" and "weaknesses", and size is certainly not the only criterion of "strength".

It seems clear that it is legitimate to apply such principles not only to individuals but to denominations, and that if they apply to the missionary's relationship to those alongside whom he stands when he preaches to them, they apply *a fortiori* within the Church itself. Nor need they apply only to "non-theological" or avowedly inessential matters; St Paul's attitude to the keeping of the Law—an essential theological matter if ever there was one—illustrates this, as we can see if we compare his condemnation of St Peter's behaviour in Antioch (Gal. 2) with his own adherence to the Law on various occasions, and his statement in 1 Corinthians 9. 19–23. It will of course be questioned whether there is any valid analogy between St Paul's attitude to these problems and the attitude which we ought to adopt now in face of our ecumenical difficulties. This is not the place to argue the point, but at least it may be suggested that in a situation where non-theological factors are as tangled and long-lasting as they are in Britain we must accept them as being relevant in our assessment of the riches which we are being severally summoned to bring into the unity of Christ's Church, and must take action accordingly. In the centenary year which commemorates both the Scottish Reformation and the Restoration it is perhaps salutary to remember that if certain key figures in our history (Mary Tudor, for example) had lived longer and others had died sooner, England might have become a Presbyterian land and Scotland an Episcopalian; and it would be interesting if unprofitable to speculate on what the non-theological factors would have looked like then.

It is undoubtedly true that in the past the Episcopate has been rejected partly because it has been the instrument by which monarchs imposed their plans upon their unwilling people; and it might even be true that to-day Anglicans are being asked, in consequence of this and other legacies of the past, to accept as equal with their own the ordained ministries of non-Episcopal churches, not on the basis of their validity or in spite of their invalidity, but because the issue

was originally and still is a wider one than that of the status of the ministry and its position within the Church, and we can only do penance for the sins of the past by acknowledging that the purely "doctrinal" categories of orthodoxy, heresy and schism have never told the whole story and still cannot do so. Thus factors in part non-theological might, on sound theological reasoning, lead to the temporary abandonment of a fundamental conviction of many Anglicans in order that that same conviction might be resurrected and re-established—re-formed, in fact—"within the law of Christ" (1 Corinthians 9. 21). We must get away from the idea that reunion will come when each party asks the other to accept something which it now fully possesses, and must face the truth that reunion will come when we are prepared to *give up* something for the sake of unity, in the faith that we shall receive it back in a new and richer form when a greater degree of visible unity has been established.

But having made this monstrous suggestion about death and new life, one must go on at once to suggest that similar actions would be required of Presbyterians. To take one example, the parity of ministers under the Lordship of Christ may appear to some to be a much less fundamental matter than the securing of a true succession through episcopal ordination—indeed, not to be fundamental at all. But it has deep roots in the Reformed tradition and its understanding of scripture, and the equality of all men before God and before the law (a different but not unrelated principle) has even longer and deeper roots in Scottish history. To abandon the present formulation of this principle in order to recover parity in a deeper sense which would allow for, and perhaps require, external differences of degree (if not of *order* in the technical sense) might be one equivalent act of renunciation for a people to whom this parity of ministers and equality of all men before God is and should remain something dearly cherished. We shall be free to do this within the law of Christ, we shall be "strong" to do it, in so far as we are ready to acknowledge that our previous practice has been due in part to non-theological pressures, sins of different kinds committed on both sides of the border and historical forces in which the good and the bad can never be finally disentangled any more than the theological and the non-theological factors.

But these are no more than vague and probably misleading adumbrations. The point is that in all cases an act of abnegation would be undertaken on the basis of an explicit recognition that non-theological as well as theological considerations must be taken into account together in determining the way forward. This is perhaps an extension or variation of the principle stressed by Bishop Newbigin in THEOLOGY for June 1958, that "we do not demand of each other certain measures of reform as the precondition of acceptance" of one another, and that "when we turn together to God in an act of repentance, which includes a willingness to surrender our separate existences in order to put ourselves afresh under the judgment and mercy of God, *at that point* we accept one another as we are" (p. 227). Such an acceptance of one another will prove unreal unless we see

that it must lay bare our whole existence, and not merely our faulty churchmanship, for renewal in the image of Christ. For good or ill, alike in Scotland and England, the national Church and the national characteristics are still very closely intertwined. Thus we might be helped to avoid the dangers of a union in which certain vital points are deliberately left ambiguous (a point which has worried some in connexion with the North India scheme of reunion).

This rather involved exordium on non-theological factors and their importance for inter-church relations in Britain must not obscure the fact that vital theological points are still at issue. The 1960 General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, basing its conclusion on reports received from the Presbyteries, has singled out four of these as requiring further study. They are

(*a*) the meaning of unity, as distinct from uniformity, in Church order;
(*b*) the meaning of "validity" as applied to ministerial orders;
(*c*) the doctrine of Holy Communion; and
(*d*) the meaning of "the Apostolic Succession" as related to all these matters.

To these four we might add the question of the significance and status of the eldership, one which is at the moment internal to the Presbyterian churches rather than inter-confessional, but will certainly be of importance in future discussion.

Of the four, perhaps only the last question requires a word of comment at the moment. There is a great deal of confusion in the Church of Scotland about the meaning of the phrase "Apostolic Succession", and it has been suggested (e.g. in the *Expository Times* for June 1959, p. 273) that two different criteria of apostolicity lie behind the much-quoted sentences in the Lambeth Report of 1958, one of which asserts that "Anglican churches ought to be ready to recognize the Presbyterian churches as true parts of the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church", while the other deals with the fact that intercommunion is nevertheless not yet possible.[1] There is clearly much to be done here, and anything that Anglicans can do to help us will be most welcome! Differences about the meaning of succession as it is understood in the churches concerned may well depend on far-reaching differences about the nature of the Church, which will be mentioned later.

This suggests a further comment. To Scotsmen it sometimes seems as if the Anglican Church holds together a great variety of beliefs under the umbrella of a common order and liturgy, and in that sense the organization guarantees the unity. Not what you believe but how you do things, to put it crudely. That the Anglican Church in fact has a far greater inner cohesion than this we may readily admit. But there is a danger that a unity, or an inter-communion, achieved by the adoption of certain common elements of order, and no more, would be worse than the present disunity; for, apart from other considerations, the Church in Scotland has in the past lacked this capacity for tolerating variety of belief within a common order

[1] Report of the Lambeth Conference, 1958, ii. 43 and 44.

and could hardly be expected to grow into it quickly; perhaps does not even find it altogether admirable. Therefore, while the summons to unity is as urgent as ever, it is important to avoid a structural uniformity which might lead to nothing better than some sort of competitive coexistence beneath the shade of the episcopal umbrella.

Similar remarks might be made with regard to intercommunion. The Church of Scotland, which now practises open communion with many other churches, has not always done so, although it has rarely, if ever, banned intercommunion with Episcopalians; Thomas Gillespie of Carnock in the eighteenth century was one of the first to advocate some such open practice (a strong evangelical, be it noted, and no "moderate"). And while most of us in the Church of Scotland would plead earnestly that Anglicans should recognize us in deed as well as word by admitting us to their table, some have recently been pointing out that intercommunion could all too easily become the end of the road instead of the next stage. The Bishop of Woolwich's plea for concelebration may well be the solution here (THEOLOGY, October 1959, pp. 402–408), although even that might become too easy a resting-place—a sort of multi-racialism, the black and the white side by side but not one.

The foregoing paragraphs have been mainly concerned with relations between the Church of Scotland and the Church of England. But if organic unity on a given national soil is assumed to be our object (and this has not been widely questioned in Scotland during the last few years) the most immediate practical questions will in the end be those which confront the Church of Scotland and the Episcopal Church in Scotland. Through the Tell Scotland movement and in other ways, these two churches have been co-operating more closely in recent years than ever before; and it came as something of a shock to many Presbyterians that the Episcopal Church did not find itself able to join in the quatercentenary celebrations of the Reformation. A word of comment on this might therefore be in place.

The schism between Presbyterians and Episcopalians is younger than the Reformation, and although its antecedents can be found much earlier it only became a schism at the time of the revolution settlement of 1689 and 1690. Until that date there had been no interchurch relations in Scotland in the modern sense; the question was whether the Kirk's one face should be Presbyterian or Episcopalian, or (as some have always believed possible) both. The era of interchurch relations and of toleration had its first unpromising and intolerant beginnings in the years from 1690 to 1714, which have been so ably described by A. C. Cheyne in the *Scottish Journal of Theology* for December 1959; and it is hard to avoid the suggestion that the Episcopal Church has very naturally allowed its unhappy memories of 1690 and the following century or more to obscure the fact that in some ways it owes quite as much to the Scottish Reformation as does the Established Church or any other in Scotland save the Roman.

This verdict will of course be contested by some; indeed there

seems to be a view alive in Scotland (and not unknown south of the border) which maintains that Episcopalians are to be distinguished from Romans only by the fact that the latter owe obedience to the Vatican. The Church of Scotland has its corresponding myths; and one of the most urgent needs to-day is that all should recognize that the Reformation was something different from, although not unrelated to, the achievement of any one form of church order. An effort has been made to see that the Reformation celebrations are ecumenical in character, and it is hard to avoid a feeling of regret that it has not proved possible for Episcopalians as a body to make their distinctive contribution to this.

But if this suggestion be rejected, it is perhaps legitimate to ask whether a nostalgia for bygone political loyalties and the veneration of Charles King and martyr are altogether dead; or in other words whether political factors are not still in spite of everything a divisive factor in the ecclesiastical situation in Scotland. If this is true, there is a lesson for the larger church here no less than for the smaller; and the lesson for us Presbyterians is perhaps this, that the question of authority in Church and State is still important and that we must not suppose that in either realm we in Scotland have reached a final or ideal solution. We have successfully battled against the divine right of kings and we have outgrown the divine right of Presbytery; now we have come up against something that looks from the outside a little like the divine right of bishops, and we are not going to have it. Of course a moment's reflection will show that this is unfair, and so would the briefest experience of the Episcopal Church from within; the Joint Report of 1957 was indeed, from one point of view, a sustained argument to show that *episcope* (if not *episcopoi*) is not a denial but a corollary of the Crown Rights of the Redeemer. But the Presbyterian past lives here no less than the Episcopalian, and it must be transcended not by ignoring it but by facing it as the partly theological, partly political, thing that it is. And although it is no doubt providential, it does seem to Presbyterians to be one of the ironies of providence that we now have to face and try to understand a claim for the historic episcopate that is higher than any made by the episcopal party in Scotland in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Finally, it should be borne in mind that the currents of theological thought and practice in nineteenth-century England have left their mark on Scotland too. This is of course most evident in the case of the Episcopal Church, which appears to an outsider to owe a great deal both in thought and practice to the Tractarian influence. It is also true of the Church of Scotland to a much smaller extent and in a less direct manner. There is no doubt some influence to be discerned from the Oxford movement upon the revival of worship in the Church of Scotland. A few would deplore this influence; but without going into that question we can at least point to one way in which this revival of worship (unhappy phrase!) has contributed to the ecumenical debate. It has reminded us that, just as in Holy Communion and the preaching of the Word we know the Unity of

the Body through an experience which unites the past, the present and the future, so also the unity of the Church is something in which the past, the present and the future come together: when the Christ who died and rose again gives himself in the gift of the Spirit to his church as it encounters the vision of the fullness awaiting it at the end of days, then the Church is ready to manifest the unity which is his gift. As certain also of your own writers have said: "It is by Word and sacrament that the Holy Spirit unites the eschatological and the historical, and makes the Church. It is in the unity of the one faith, under the oversight of one ministry, and in one fellowship of the sacraments that we on earth participate in the eschatological unity of the Church."[1] In Scotland the Apostolic Succession too often appears as something simply historical and in no sense eschatological, a doctrine of tactual succession which verges on the magical. Tractarian theories of Apostolic Succession have perhaps had something to do with this,[2] and misunderstanding and distrust have done the rest.

This is not simply a request for a fuller exposition of what Apostolic Succession means in the context of the nature of the Church—although that does seem to be still very necessary; it is also a plea that we should take very seriously the Reformed understanding of the Church as the place where the Word is purely preached, the Sacraments duly administered and discipline rightly exercised as a definition of a body at once historical and eschatological in character, distorted in every respect by sinfulness and waiting at every point for the perfecting gift of the Spirit; and that Anglicans should help us to integrate this with their own understanding of the ministry and its relation to the Body. We must somehow get away from the idea that historical continuity in a visible form and active obedience in faith are mutually exclusive criteria of apostolicity: each implies the other, and this is a truth for which Anglicans and Presbyterians alike can claim to have ample warrant in their own traditions.

As the next stage in the conversations between the churches unfolds it is vitally important that on all sides the *laos* as a whole should come closer to the encounter. In Scotland especially, the Reformation is rightly celebrated for restoring the sacraments and the whole life of the Church to the people; one of the greatest scandals of the period just before the Reformation was the Church's neglect of its task in the parishes of the land. To-day this sense of the Church as a possession of the people still persists and, distorted as it often is, is something to be built upon; it means, among other things, that the leaders of the Church of Scotland must at all costs avoid giving the impression that any kind of diplomacy is being carried on behind closed doors. At the same time we shall perhaps be justified in asking Anglican leaders to do all they can to avoid that quite unintentional note of condescension which sometimes creeps into Anglican utterances and touches the chord to which Scottish

[1] William Nicholls, *Ecumenism and Catholicity*, p. 53.

[2] See the article by Bishop Noel Hall in the *Scottish Journal of Theology*, June 1958, pp. 113–33.

ears above all are susceptible. To a Scotsman it sometimes seems as if the English, like all other nations, have their nationalism deep-rooted within them, differing only from other nationalisms in this, that with the English it is so deep-rooted that they never notice it. No doubt an Englishman will be able to point to the corresponding, but different, faults of the Scots. May both peoples take to heart and apply to their own churches the words of the Archbishop of York: "(The Church of England, or of Scotland) is sent not to commend itself as 'the best type of Christianity', but by its very brokenness to point to the universal Church wherein all have died."[1] With this profoundly Reformed and profoundly Catholic utterance we can surely all agree.

ROBIN BARBOUR.

Liturgiology 1939-1960

IN no other branch of theology has interest increased in the last twenty-one years as it has in Liturgy. The number of scholars, professional and amateur, working in this field is probably about the same as it always was. Among Anglicans it is undoubtedly smaller than it was a generation ago. But the interest of ordinary people in the subject is very much greater than ever before. The reasons for this are various. In the last analysis no doubt it is theological. The doctrine which occupies the attention of this generation is the doctrine of the Church. The Church is seen to express itself before God and man in liturgical worship. There is therefore a renewed interest in liturgical forms. But there are also no doubt contributory causes of a more practical kind. The Churches of the Reformation, under the influence of the Ecumenical Movement, are now ready to reconsider questions which were regarded as closed even a generation ago; they are investigating the whole history of their own traditions, and they are prepared to judge them by external standards. The Church of Rome feels sufficiently secure from the attacks of Protestantism to loosen the straitjacket into which the Roman liturgy was forced by the Counter-Reformation. The Church of England, which for a century has been acutely conscious of the divergence between the usages of the Primitive Church and the Book of Common Prayer which was designed to restore them, has by this time recovered from the events of 1927-28, and is preparing to start again. Liturgical pressure is being exerted not only by the other provinces of the Anglican Communion, many of which have carried through revisions of varying merit, but also by the Church of South India, which has produced liturgical forms of a highly provocative kind. And upon all churches, to a greater or less extent, the grim fact of a post-Christian world is exercising an increasing influence. The Church is being forced to give public expression to its changed status.

[1] *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, p. 220.

In most countries nowadays the Church is not a powerful organization, established or at least patronized by the secular power. It is a small group, living in the middle of a secularized society, needing to organize its life in a way that is understood by its own members and is capable of being understood by those outside. And of that life liturgical worship is the heart. Liturgy therefore is no longer a matter of study for scholars, professional or amateur, but has become a matter of lively and urgent interest to a great number of thinking Christians.

This change had actually begun to take place in the years immediately before our period begins. Four important books were put out in three successive years, each of them treating of Liturgy broadly against a different background. In 1935 Hebert s *Liturgy and Society* was published; in 1936 Evelyn Underhill's *Worship*, and a collection of essays by members of Mansfield College, Oxford, entitled *Christian Worship*; and in 1937 *The Parish Communion*. But the book that has done more than any other to stimulate the intelligent layman to a study of Liturgy falls within our period. This is Dix's *The Shape of the Liturgy*, put out in 1945. It is an untidy book, and it is an uneven book. It contains much with which liturgical scholars may reasonably disagree. But by its exuberance and vividness and verve it has sold liturgical study to numbers of readers who have been left untouched by writers more sober in style and in judgment. And in presenting to the public in a readable form the results of liturgical research over the previous fifty years, it has accomplished an invaluable task of *haute vulgarization*. Among comparable books with a less wide appeal Srawley's *The Early History of the Liturgy* must stand first. Written originally in 1913, it was brought up to date in 1947 because of "the great advance of liturgical studies which has marked the intervening period". Dry, judicious, equipped with a workable bibliography and numerous references, it forms the best possible introduction to liturgical study for the serious amateur. Ratcliff's essay on *Christian Liturgy and Worship* in *The Study of Theology*, edited by Kirk, 1939, exhibits the same qualities, in spite of the compression inevitable in such a piece of work. Third comes Jungmann's *Missarum Solemnia*, 1948, translated into English, two volumes, 1951, 1955. Compendious in its range and exhaustive in its treatment, it will obviously remain the most widely used text-book on the Roman Mass for years to come. But what is most significant about the book is the point of view from which it is written. Like Klauser's *The Western Liturgy and its History*, translated Cross, 1952, it assumes that a new period in the history of the Roman liturgy is beginning under our eyes, and that *The Epoch of Changelessness or Rubricism* is over.

This seems to be confirmed by the decrees which have been issued by the Holy See during our period. *Sacramentum Ordinis* 1947 defined for the future the form and matter of Holy Order in the Roman rite. *Cum nostra* 1955 simplified the rubrics both of the Breviary and of the Missal. *Maxima Redemptionis* 1955 imposed a revised *Ordo* for the days of Holy Week, and included the new

Paschal Vigil, which had already been put out in 1951-52. Those who wish to forecast the way in which the Roman Rite is likely to be revised in the near future would do well to study *Cum nostra*, which is only to last *donec aliter provisum fuerit*, and contains in itself the lines upon which further change will presumably be made. They should also study the rubrics of *Ordo Hebdomadae Sanctae Instauratus*,[1] which may well form a blue print for the revision of the Mass for the other fifty-one weeks in the year. Other Churches have shown similar signs of liturgical activity. In 1940 a new *Book of Common Order* was issued by authority of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland; and in 1959 drafts were published of revised Baptism and Confirmation services for the Church of England, which had been submitted to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York by their Liturgical Commission in 1958.

Those whose interests lie in the field of Western Liturgies have been well served with new editions in the last twenty-one years. Andrieu, who put out his first volume on the *Ordines Romani* as long ago as 1931, published three more volumes, containing the texts, in 1948, 1951, 1956. Mohlburg is producing a series of new editions. *Sacramentarium Veronense* (*Leonianum*) 1956, *Missale Gallicanum Vetus* 1958, *Liber Sacramentorum Romanae Aeclesiae Ordinis Annie Circuli* (*Gelasianum*) 1960 have already appeared. In 1949 Bourque published his *Étude sur les Sacramentaires Romains*; and Chavasse produced a monumental study of the Gelasian Sacramentary in 1958, putting forward an interesting hypothesis about the origin of the "Gelasian" tradition. Van Dijk and Hazelden Walker have now presented us with *The Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy* 1960, a study of the liturgy of the Papal Court and of the Franciscan Order in the Thirteenth Century, based on an exhaustive study of the manuscripts.

Those whose interests lie in the field of primitive liturgy have been less well served. The Homily of Melito of Sardis on the Pascha was first edited in 1940. Roberts and Capelle produced a new edition of the Dêr Belizeh fragment in 1949, after a further reconstruction of the papyrus fragments had been made. Lietzmann's *Messe und Herrenmahl* is now at last available in an English translation, published at Leyden in fascicles between 1953 and 1958. Connolly's vindication of the Ambrosian authorship of *De Sacramentis* is now finally accepted, and the treatise, edited by Faller, was published among the works of St Ambrose in the Vienna Corpus in 1955. In 1958 Salle put out an edition of some baptismal material, found in the Ethiopic version of *Apostolic Tradition*, which was rejected by Connolly as non-Hippolytean, and was therefore excluded from the editions of Dix and Botte. A compendious work by Hanssens in 1958, *La Liturgie d'Hippolyte*, gives further cause for doubting whether the text as edited by Dix and accepted by Botte is quite so trustworthy as has been supposed.

[1] A critical edition in two volumes has been published in Latin by H. A. P. Schmidt, S.J., *Hebdomada Sancta*. Rome, 1956, 1957.

It is probably theological and pastoral pressure rather than advance in purely liturgical knowledge that has led to a rediscovery of the first half of the Mass. How far this section of the rite has been misunderstood can be seen by the names which are commonly given to it—Mass of the Catechumens, Pro-Anaphora, Fore-Mass, Ante-Communion. Dix realized this, but merely added Synaxis to the list of titles. A still more cumbersome term, the Ministry of the Word, is often employed. It is thought by some to have too Reformed a flavour, but is defended from this imputation by others on the supposed authority of Tertullian, *De cultu fem.* II, 11. But at least it is functional, in the sense that it expresses the purpose of the first half of the rite. The Eucharistic lectionary is everywhere under discussion, with its inevitable concomitant, the calendar. The Church of Scotland in 1940 restored the liturgical year on the basis of the Temporale of the Book of Common Prayer, and in 1951 put out a revised lectionary with a two-year cycle based on this calendar. This provides for every Sunday and other holy day in the temporale three lessons—one from the Old Testament, one from the Epistles and one from the Gospels. In 1953 Allan McArthur published *The Evolution of the Christian Year,* in which he investigates the origins of the Christian Year, though he has not obtained universal agreement for some of his conclusions. But in a sequel, *The Christian Year and Lectionary Reform,* 1958, he provides suggestions for a revision of the 1940 calendar of the Church of Scotland, which are specifically made as a basis for a more satisfactory lectionary. Calendrical reform is also under way in the Church of Rome, as can be seen from the provisions of the decree *Cum nostra*; and lectionary reform is also contemplated. Ellard's *The Mass in Transition* 1956 makes it clear that the authorities are encouraging discussion on the subject; and suggestions are being made for a three-year or four-year cycle of lessons for the Sundays after Epiphany and Pentecost, and for continuous readings on weekdays.

Critical study and proposals for liturgical revision have also combined in the matter of the "Prayer for the Church". Capelle in 1939 established sufficiently the history of the *Orationes Solemnes,* now said in the Roman Rite only on Good Friday. On the introduction of the Litany at the beginning of the service in the late fifth century they disappeared from the position which they were already occupying in the time of Justin. The subsequent disappearance of the Litany, and its replacement by *Kyrie eleison,* has left the Roman rite without any intercession at all. In consequence a demand is being made for the restoration of intercessory prayer to the Mass—after the Sermon and the Creed and before the opening of the Offertory—in the position which it occupied in the early centuries, if not in precisely the same form.

The Offertory has for some time now been a matter of divergence of opinion between scholars and parish priests. For theological and pastoral reasons parishes have been restoring the "Offertory Procession", i.e. the procession of the laity to the altar to present the oblations of the Church, where they are accepted by Deacon or

Priest and arranged on the altar for Consecration. Such a ceremony is necessarily striking, and its prominence has been justified on the grounds that the Offertory is an integral part of the Eucharist, and constitutes the first moment in the "Four-Action Shape", representing the taking of the bread and wine by the Lord at the Supper. Theologians like Mascall have questioned the desirability of such prominence being given to the Offertory on the ground that the true "offering of the gifts" is to be found in the Consecration. Liturgists like Botte are prepared to challenge the popular thesis that the people's offertory existed at all in the earliest stratum of liturgical history. Michell claims that the second/third century Eucharist was essentially a Two-Action, not a Four-Action, rite, viz. Consecration and Communion—neither Offertory nor Fraction being prominent parts of the function. Capelle issues the warning: "It is our belief that, taken in the wrong sense, the offertory procession may be gravely prejudicial to the true understanding of the Mass."

The section of the Roman Mass which lies between the elevation on the doxology of the Canon and the Communion has been under discussion among scholars. Paternoster, Fraction, Commixture and Pax follow each other in no logical order. The Fraction for no apparent reason is performed during the embolism of the Lord's Prayer. The Commixture, now meaningless, is made with the formula of the Kiss of Peace. The Kiss of Peace is given during the anthem of the Fraction. As long ago as 1941 Capelle drew attention to the disorder of this part of the service, and even suggested a method whereby it could be rearranged so as to make comparative sense. Andrieu's edition of the Roman *Ordines* makes it possible to trace its development after A.D. 750 and to conjecture its pre-history in the preceding centuries. Capelle's article, suggesting as it does a measure of reform, is an indication that this is a place where the order of the Mass may well be revised. It should also prove a salutary warning to those who uncritically interpolate whole sections of another rite into their own!

But it is in connexion with the structure of the Eucharistic Prayer that the greatest change of opinion has taken place in our period. Frere published *The Anaphora* in 1938, and made the last attempt that will ever be made to put forward the "traditional view"—that the Eucharistic Prayer of the primitive church consisted of Preface, Sanctus, Institution Narrative, Anamnesis-Oblation, Epiclesis, on the lines of the Prayer in *Apostolic Constitutions VIII*. During the period under review the "critical" view has increasingly gained ground—that such a sequence is not to be found in any church before the fourth century, and that there was great diversity between local churches in the shape of the Prayer during the second and third centuries, if not actually in Apostolic times. As long ago as 1832 William Palmer of Worcester had written in *Origines Liturgicae*: "It seems to have been often assumed by the learned, that there was originally some one apostolic form of liturgy in the Christian church, to which all the monuments of ancient liturgies, and the notices which the Fathers supply, might be reduced," adding dryly: "Were this hy-

pothesis supported by facts, it would be very valuable." By the beginning of the twentieth century the "critical" view was developing. Not only was it being asserted that there was great diversity of content in the Eucharistic Prayer in the early Church, but also that there were Eucharists of radically different types. Edmund Bishop in Appendix VI to Connolly's *Homilies of Narsai* 1909 wrote: "Going back as far as extant documents permit us to go, and on a point where a primitive written source is evidenced, the enquirer finds himself in the canon of the mass in the presence of a duality of rite." In 1926 Lietzmann published *Messe und Herrenmahl*, in which he seeks to establish this duality by his hypothesis of a Pauline and a non-Pauline type of Eucharist.

Dix in *The Shape of the Liturgy* rejects the "traditional" claim that the anaphoras of Eastern Christendom represent the original Eucharistic Prayer, or at least a legitimate development of it. But he seeks to re-establish what he calls "the essential point of the traditional theory—*a single origin of the Eucharistic rite*". He claims that this origin is to be found in the Last Supper; that the Last Supper was not the Passover, but a *chaburah* meal; that we know from Jewish documents what graces were used at such meals; and that therefore we have in these prayers, which consisted of a series of thanksgiving, the nucleus from which all subsequent Eucharistic Prayers have developed; that these Prayers developed in the second and third centuries by growing a "second half"; and that such a developed Prayer can be seen in the Eucharistic Prayer as it appears in his edition of *Apostolic Tradition*. Such a theory has the merit of concentrating attention upon the *eucharistiae*, which must presumably have been the predominant ingredient of any prayer that acquired the name Eucharistic. But it can be heavily criticized. As long ago as 1935 Jeremias had shown that a good case can be made for identifying the Last Supper with the Passover Meal. The Jewish evidence for first-century practice is not so reliable as Dix supposed. Nor is the Eucharistic Prayer in the Verona Latin of *Apostolic Tradition* above suspicion. Dix himself emended it in one place, where for obvious reasons he preferred to follow the version in *Testmentum Domini*. But for the rest he accepted it wholeheartedly. Such an acceptance would scarcely be possible to-day.

It is upon a criticism of the text of the Eucharistic Prayer in *Apostolic Tradition* that the latest contribution to the debate has been based. Ratcliff published two articles in *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* in 1950 entitled *The Sanctus and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora*. In his essay in *The Study of Theology* he had already called attention to the Irenaean language of the Hippolytean Prayer, but had expressed his doubts as to its authenticity as a whole. In these articles he has used Justin and Irenaeus as yardsticks by which to measure the Prayer, and has found it seriously wanting. The thanksgivings for Redemption, the offering of the Bread and Cup in remembrance of the Passion and Resurrection, and the thanksgiving for being accounted worthy to stand before God and to minister to him he has accepted without hesitation, and

—with less conviction—the Institution Narrative. But the absence of a thanksgiving for Creation has convinced him that the Prayer has been beheaded; and the presence of a petition that the Spirit may enter the Bread and Wine and so pass into the communicants makes him believe that it has been curtailed, and given a new ending. For such a view of Consecration is at variance with the teaching of Justin and Irenaeus and of Hippolytus himself. How then did the Prayer originally end? Ratcliff suggests that the offering of the Bread and Cup by the Priestly People was followed by a petition for its acceptance at the Heavenly Altar and for admission to the heavenly worship, leading to the singing of the Sanctus. It is notorious that *Apostolic Tradition,* with the dependent *Testamentum Domini,* is the only liturgy in Christendom in which the Sanctus does not occur; and it is difficult to believe that it only entered the liturgical tradition in the fourth century, when it is first attested in *De Mysteriis* of Cyril of Jerusalem. As a chant it fulfills no particular purpose in the surviving Eucharistic Prayers, and occupies a different position in each of the various traditions. If it is accepted as the original climax and doxology of the Eucharistic Prayer, its function is plain, the Eucharist being regarded as the new and living way into the presence of God, which culminates in participation in the worship of heaven. But if it originally fulfilled such a function in the rite, why has it ceased to do so, and why does it nowhere occupy its original place? The change that comes over Eucharistic theology during the fourth century no doubt accounts for the various transformations of the Prayer. Ratcliff suggests that "the surviving literature, and not least the historic liturgies, either supply the answers or offer evidence which suggests them". We should be grateful to him if he would continue his articles on the subject.

Michell, who accepts Ratcliff's hypothesis in this matter, points out that the thanksgivings alluded to by Justin are not two but three. There is thanksgiving for Creation and thanksgiving for Redemption; but there is also thanksgiving "for being accounted worthy". Justin maintains that God only accepts sacrifices from worthy men, i.e. from his priests, and that he does this in the Eucharist. This third thanksgiving then is a thanksgiving for the Priesthood of the Church. Michell points out that the same series of thanksgivings is to be found in the song of the elders in Apocalypse 4 and 5, in circumstances which are clearly Eucharistic. He also points to the Eucharistic Prayer of *Apostolic Tradition,* where the offering of the Bread and Cup is made in the context of a thanksgiving for being accounted worthy to stand before God and to minister to him. It has seemed valuable to go into this matter in some detail, in order to illustrate how far the ground of discussion has shifted since Frere published *The Anaphora* in 1938.

The draft services submitted by the Liturgical Commission have, perhaps inevitably, revived a controversy about the relation of Confirmation to Baptism, of which the first shots in modern times were fired toward the end of last century, when Puller published *What is the distinctive grace of Confirmation?* 1880, and Mason *The Rela-*

tion of Confirmation to Baptism 1893. The revisers of 1927–28, by appointing Acts VIII as a lesson to be read at Confirmation, seemed to favour the Puller/Mason interpretation of the rite, although in doing so they were merely making explicit the reference to "the example of thy holy Apostles" contained in all Prayer Books from 1549 to 1662. The second round was started when Dix published a lecture *The Theology of Confirmation in relation to Baptism* 1946. Lampe replied with *The Seal of the Spirit* 1951, and Thornton replied to Lampe with *Confirmation, its place in the Baptismal Mystery* 1953. A useful summary of the controversy can be found in Leeming's *Principles of Sacramental Theology* 1956. The latest contribution comes from Thurian in *La Confirmation* 1957.

The Archbishops' Commissioners in drafting new services were faced with a difficult problem. They had to satisfy those who believe that Confirmation is nothing more than the confirmation in adult life of promises made by proxy in infancy, to which is appended a solemn episcopal blessing. They had to satisfy those who believe that Confirmation is the means of conferring an additional gift of the Spirit, an *increase* of the Baptismal gift, which *strengthens* for adult life. And they had to satisfy those who believe that it is Confirmation which conveys the Baptismal gift of the Spirit, who comes to regenerate in Baptism and to complete his work by indwelling in Confirmation. The greatest care was apparently taken with the choice of lessons. Acts VIII, in spite of its use in 1928, Acts XIX, Hebrews VI have been studiously avoided, for fear their use might be held to assert unequivocally the notion of a double sign in Baptism. The Marcan account of the Lord's Baptism, which is ambiguous about the moment of the Spirit's descent, has been preferred to the Lucan, which places the descent of the Spirit after the Baptism is over and while a prayer is being said. The account of the Lord's taking little children into his arms and laying hands on them and blessing them in Mark X has been excluded. For either the passage has nothing to do with Baptism, or else it seems to authorize *both* the Baptism *and* the Confirmation of Infants. The Confirmation Prayer has been restored to its original form, and the controversial term *strengthen* has therefore been omitted. The Confirmation formula has been rewritten, and shorn of the tendencious word *increase*. The renewing of the Promises has been given a far greater prominence than in 1662. In this way it was apparently hoped to produce a rite which all could use with a good conscience without enforcing their own interpretation upon others. But the desire to exclude rather than to include, which is perhaps a characteristic of the theological as opposed to the liturgical way of thinking, is obviously still very strong in certain sections of the Church of England, and will obviously render any attempt to produce a Eucharistic Prayer acceptable to all schools of thought a very difficult task for the Commissioners.

A. H. Couratin.

The York Revised Service for the Public Baptism of Infants: An Appraisement

For more than thirty years the Church of England has been seeking an adequate revision of or alternative to the Ministration of the Public Baptism of Infants contained in the Prayer Book. The need for reform has not been satisfied by the Service provided in the "Deposited Book" of 1927–8. Since that time several essays at revision have been attempted, some private, such as Fr A. G. Hebert's interesting *Essay in Baptismal Revision* published in 1947, and others under official auspices, of which the Service proposed in the Report of the Liturgical Commission, issued in November 1958, is the most recent. It is now rumoured that action is soon to be taken to close the long period of seeking, and that approval is to be solicited for one of these essays as the official alternative to the Service of the Prayer Book.

If the rumour be correct, the revision thus favoured is the *Revised Service provided by the Convocation of York for occasional use, subject to the direction of the Bishop of the Diocese.*[1] The York Service, hereafter to be cited as *York*, is little known outside its own province. It may therefore be of interest to make certain inquiries about it. What, we may ask, is its distinctive quality? Is it liturgically satisfactory? Is it an improvement upon the Service of the Prayer Book? We must add another question, not less important. "The liturgy," wrote Bossuet, "is the principal instrument of the tradition of the Church." The great archbishop's dictum is particularly true of Anglican liturgy, because that liturgy is in the language of the people. Most Anglicans (that is to say, most instructed Anglicans), to whatever province or nationality they belong, acquire and sustain their basic knowledge of Christian beliefs from what they read in or hear from their Prayer Books. We must also inquire, then, whether *York* is an effective instrument of the Church's tradition about Baptism, a tradition, it may be added, which is both ample and rich.

Before gathering the answers to these questions from the text of the Service, it may be convenient to recall the circumstances of *York's* origination. At a meeting of the Full Synod of the Northern Convocation, held on 15 October 1943, the Bishop of Sheffield moved the appointment of a joint committee "to draft a simpler and more intelligible Order of Holy Baptism for submission to Convocation". The Bishop is reported as having said in the course of the speech elucidating his motion,

> The Service as it stood was difficult. The majority who came to it were simple and uninstructed, and to a considerable extent they always would be simple, if not uninstructed. The question they had to ask was, Could

[1] The text is printed in *York Journal of Convocation* [*Y.J.C.*], September 1951, Appendix pp. xxix–xxxvi; it has also been printed upon cards for use in church, but the cards are not easy to obtain.

> the form be made more simple and the language more homely, and still express a true and deep theology? Secondly, the outward form, like the breaking of bread, was simple to understand; need it be so wrapped in words? He always felt that the Confirmation Service gained greatly from a simple brevity which made more emphatic the act. Thirdly, the whole idea and practice of sponsorship was very strange to people to-day, and even if qualified godparents could be found, it imparted a sense of unreality into the service for a great number of people. Whatever the purists might say, the responsibility of godparents would be a more real one if they promised not in the name of the child but in their own name to do their religious duties, by the Church and by the child they cared for.[1]

The Bishop's motion was successful. The joint committee was appointed. It consisted of twelve persons, two of them bishops (the Bishop of Sheffield being convener and subsequently chairman) and the remainder being members of the Lower House, of whom one, the Dean of York, was well known for liturgical learning. By the end of July 1945 the committee's draft of a Service was completed, and was submitted to the newly elected Convocation with a report in which the committee indicated how it had handled its terms of reference, and what it believed the merits of its work to be:

> When the committee came to grips with its task, it came to the conclusion that it would not do to have an order for this primary Sacrament so simple as to be defective in theology, so stark as to be wanting in mystery, so short as to be lacking in dignity. . . . Without claiming any perfection for the Service which follows, we would point out that it is a little shorter than the 1928 service, that as far as may be it avoids difficult words and phrases, that by comparison both with 1662 and 1928 it has a "psychological simplicity", and that it gives the congregation more to do than they do.[2]

The committee's report was received; but six years were to elapse before the Northern Convocation reached a decision about the matter. In May 1946 the Lower House, after lengthy debate, referred the report back to the committee with suggestions for improving the Service. In the following October, instead of receiving the amended report as the committee had hoped that it would, the Lower House decided that "this committee shall not proceed further until the theology of Baptism and Confirmation has been studied and clarified".[3] There the history of the Service might have ended, had not the Upper House, untroubled by the theological hesitation of the Lower, resolved in May 1947 to proceed with revision. Two years later the Upper House sent the results of its work, bearing the title *A Simple Order for the Ministration of Public Baptism of Infants*, to the Lower House with a request for the suggestion of amendments.[4] There followed a period of revived debate alike in separate Houses and in Full Synod, suggested amendments being referred back to the joint committee, which by this time had been reduced in number to nine persons. At length it was found possible to agree upon a definitive form of the Service. *York*, now qualified no more as

[1] *Y.J.C.*, October 1943, p. 55.
[2] Ibid., October 1945, Appendix pp. xix f.
[3] Ibid., October 1946, p. 58.
[4] Ibid., May 1949, pp. 15 ff. and 75.

Simple but merely as *Revised*, was approved by resolutions carried in both Houses on 19 September 1951, all but eight years from its inception.

Although *York*, as the outcome of two years' hewing, chipping and sandpapering by bishops and proctors, may rightly be regarded as the product of the whole Northern Convocation, its basic ideas and broad cast are nevertheless still those of the original designers, the joint committee of 1943. This is immediately noticeable in the disposition of the Service under captions. *York* is divided into eight portions, each one introduced by a caption in capital letters. The captions are as follows, 1. *The Preparation*, 2. *The Gospel*, 3. *The Duties of Parents and Godparents*, 4. *The Three-fold Promise made by the Godparents*, 5. *The Blessing of the Water*, 6. *The Baptism*, 7. *The Reception*, and 8. *The Thanksgiving*.[1] In employing captions *York* has followed the example set by the Service of 1928: but it has doubled the number of captions without gaining that increase of intelligibility which, we may surmise, was their purpose. It might have been imagined, for instance, that *The Preparation* was a comprehensive caption embracing all that precedes *The Baptism*, and that 2, 3, 4 and 5 were sub-titles marking the successive elements of *The Preparation*. That this is unlikely, however, is suggested by the use of identical type for all the captions without exception. The uncertainties caused by this ill-considered, or unconsidered usage, not confined to *The Preparation*, will be noted in the appropriate place.

The Preparation consists of an address to be recited by the minister "when the people have gathered round the font". The address first informs the parents and godparents that they have brought the child to be baptized; it next informs them that they are asking for the child "a gift from God", and alludes to John 3. 5 as dominical sanction for Baptism; it then specifies the gift bestowed upon the child by God in the sacrament as "that which by his own nature he cannot have, that is to say, new birth as the child of God, the forgiveness of sin, and an inheritance in his eternal kingdom". The assertions here made are in themselves unexceptionable: but they lack incisiveness of expression. By comparison with its vigorous (though not unamendable) original in the draft of 1943,[2] the address of *York* appears trite and flat. Possibly its style was thought to be adapted to the capacities of the simple and uninstructed; even so, will the references to "that which by his own nature he cannot have", to "new birth as a child of God", and to the inheritance in the eternal kingdom bear a meaning clear and plain to the uninstructed mind? *York's* address is no shorter than that of 1662; it is less logical and close-knit; if it has removed the perplexity of original sin, it offers two new perplexities of its own.

The address concludes with a passage introducing *The Gospel*: "That you may be sure of the goodwill of God towards this child,

[1] The numbers do not occur in the text, but are introduced here for convenience.

[2] *Y.J.C.*, October 1945, Appendix p. xxi.

hear in the Gospel how the Lord Jesus received the children brought to him." Is *The Preparation,* then, a preparation for the Gospel? It can hardly be so, because there is no connecting thought between Gospel and address. The address is rather an introduction to the whole Service. Perhaps "Introduction" is what was meant by *Preparation.* In justice to the committee of 1943, we may note that it refrained from providing a caption for the initial address. A blank is preferable to an inexactitude.

It was hardly to be expected that an English Convocation would have the courage to jettison *motu proprio* Mark 10. 13–16 from its position of Gospel-lesson in a Service for the Baptism of Infants. It inevitably appears in *York.* A mist of sentimentality has collected around the passage, so that its irrelevance to baptism of children has been disregarded, and the nature of its connexion with baptismal rites has been overlooked. The passage, in company with its cognates in Matthew (19. 13–15) and Luke (18. 15 f.), was first adopted into the pre-baptismal Latin Scrutiny rites held on the Third, Fourth and Fifth Sundays of Lent; the passages provided authority for the practice of blessing infant catechumens with an imposition of hands.[1] The incident which the passages describe was alleged by later medieval writers to contain the Lord's institution of the sacrament of Confirmation. The Reformers, who rejected this interpretation, could nonetheless found upon the incident an argument countering Anabaptist objection against baptizing infants, and accordingly made use of one or other passage in their Orders of Baptism. Hence the presence of Mark 10. 13 ff. in the Service of the Prayer Book. The uninstructed person of to-day, ignorant of these matters and unlikely to be sentimental, might be pardoned if, hearing this passage read, he were led to wonder why, in order to "christen" a child, the less convenient practice of baptizing him with water came to be preferred to the simple benedictory handlaying performed by Jesus and described in the lesson. In a modern Service of Baptism, designed with the uninstructed in view, we should have expected, or at least hoped, to find a Gospel lesson which would offer a rationale of the sacrament being administered.

Immediately after the Gospel, and under the same caption, there follows a prayer to be said by minister and people together. The prayer runs,

> Almighty God, our heavenly Father; look graciously upon this child; embrace him with the arms of thy mercy; cleanse and sanctify him by thy Holy Spirit; and take him into the family of thy Church; so that he may live in thy love and favour for ever; through Jesus Christ our Lord.

This prayer is an improvement upon that proposed by the bishops in 1949;[2] yet two queries arise. If a simple parent inquires, "From what uncleanness is my baby to be cleansed?" what is the answer?

[1] For a short account of the scrutiny use of these passages, see C. E. Pocknee, art. "The Gospel Lection in the Rite of Infant Baptism" in THEOLOGY, December 1959, pp. 496–9.

[2] See *Y.J.C.,* May 1949, p. 15.

and where is it to be found?[1] Again, why does the prayer fail to refer to Baptism as the means whereby the fulfilment of its petitions is looked for? The failure is strange, and one which a glance at the usage of the historic baptismal liturgies could have prevented. As it stands, the prayer is more apposite to a ceremony admitting infants to a non-sacramentalist body.

At this point *York* turns aside from its course. Instead of proceeding directly towards the baptismal act, the minister, addressing himself to the parents and godparents, rehearses to them the religious duties which devolve upon them, and demands their promise to perform these duties faithfully. While fully agreeing that the ignorance and irresponsibility of many modern parents and sponsors amply justifies *York's* enlargement of and stress upon this feature, and in particular its demand for a public undertaking of faithful performance, we may yet dispute that the right place has been chosen for the feature. The "psychological simplicity" claimed for the original draft in the report of 1945 points to the beginning or the end as the right position; the importance of the feature indicates the beginning.

Apart from the matter of position, the phrasing of *The Duties* is not above reproach. The final Duty runs,

> Thirdly, to bring *him* in due time to the bishop to be confirmed; so that *he*, being strengthened with the Holy Spirit and regularly receiving the Holy Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ, may go forth into the world to serve God faithfully in the fellowship of his Church.

The compilers appear to have felt themselves obliged, for some reason, to make use of the colloquial expression, "go out into the world", although giving it a "church twist" by replacing "out" with "forth". The sense might have been clearer without the *cliché*. At all events, the passage leaves an impression of having failed exactly to express what its compilers intended to say. Another fault of diction may be noticed here. The answer to be given by the parents and godfathers to the question, "Do you promise . . . ?" is "I do." "I do" is an unemphatic answer, as "feminine" as a feminine rhyme. The emphatic, and the simple and right answer is "I promise".[2] The Convocation had forgotten Cranmer's emphatic and effective answers to the liturgical questions in his two baptismal services.

The *Three-fold Promise* which follows the *Duties* is no more than a revision of *The Promises* of 1928. The first question is an amended version of the text of 1928, "Do you, in the name of this child, renounce all that is evil, and promise to resist the temptations of the devil, the world, and the flesh, so that you will not follow or be led

[1] Possibly the word "cleanse" was allowed, for rhythmical reasons, to survive from the bishops' petition, which read, "Cleanse and protect him from the evil that is in the world and in the hearts of men".

[2] To reply that "I do" is the answer to the question in the Confirmation Service is no answer. The Confirmation question is, in fact, three questions, to which the answer would be, "I renew . . . I ratify and confirm . . . I acknowledge myself bound . . ." The comprehensive "I do", though weak, is unavoidable.

by them?" Here *York* might have consulted with benefit the simple and direct questions of the Service of 1549. The second question may be expected to cause perplexity to the simpler among the simple. It reads, "Do you, in the name of this child, promise to hold fast the Christian Faith?" After making their answer, the godparents with the minister recite the Apostles' Creed. The last of the questions of 1928, "Dost thou in the name of this child ask for baptism?" was apparently held to be superfluous. Although it has a long history behind it, and still testifies to the voluntary basis of the approach to Baptism, it has been cast out of *York*. To each of the questions the godparents again answer, "I do." The pigeon-like cooing of this four-fold "I do" recalls the Parisian song which tells how the river Seine *roucoule, roucoule, roucoule,* the while it *coule, coule, coule* along the quays.

The *Promise* is followed by two prayers. The first of these two prayers is the third of the four found after the equivalent questions of the Services of 1662 and 1928, "O merciful God, grant that this child may have power and strength", etc. The second prayer is in the main a damaged fragment struck off the end of the opening prayer of the Service of 1662 ("Almighty and everlasting God, who of Thy great mercy didst save Noah", etc.), to which has been attached, by means of compilers' glue, a chip from the end of the last of the four prayers mentioned above. The botch reads thus, "Grant that, being steadfast in faith, joyful through hope, and rooted in charity, he may at the last come to thy heavenly kingdom, through thy mercy, O blessed Lord God, who dost live and govern all things, world without end." What godparents, we may wonder, will exhale with simple relief that their godchild will no more "so pass the waves of this troublesome world, that finally he may come to the land of everlasting life"?

In what may be taken as the oldest extant baptismal liturgy,[1] prayer was made over the water as a preliminary to the rite; and the Renunciation of Satan, of which the first Promise in *York* is an equivalent, was succeeded immediately by the baptismal act. That order is logical; it is also easy for the simple mind to understand, and it is impressive. It might have been expected that this arrangement would have been adopted in *York*, and that an earlier position would have been assigned to *The Blessing of the Water*. Instead, the original committee, the Upper House, and the whole Convocation have preferred to retain the order of the Prayer Book (an order which has a history peculiar to itself) and to insert *The Blessing of the Water* between the baptismal act and its logical antecedent. Again, then, we must note a failure in "psychological simplicity", and one, further, which involves the text of the composition as well as its position.

The second half of the Blessing follows the text of the Prayer Book from "Regard, we beseech thee, the supplications", etc., with only one change; the children of God, though still "faithful", are

[1] I.e. in the rite of *Apostolic Tradition*.

no longer "elect". The first half, on the other hand, is a piece of new writing, and calls for quotation,

> It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty that we should give thanks unto thee, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty Everlasting God, because thou didst give thy most dearly beloved Son, Jesus Christ, to be made man and to suffer death for the forgiveness of our sins, to bring us out of darkness into his glorious light: who after his mighty resurrection did send his Holy Spirit upon the disciples, giving them commandment to go teach all nations and baptize them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

This passage produces upon the reader an impression of *non sequitur*, which probably arises from compression. In the original draft of 1945, the relative clause ran, "who after his mighty Resurrection and Ascension did send his Holy Spirit upon the disciples, giving them commandment to go teach", etc.[1] The inference from this statement could only be that the command to baptize was given, not directly as narrated in Matthew 28. 16 ff., but indirectly, among the occurrences of Pentecost, although unrecorded in Acts 4. The revised form of the statement weakens the inference, but does not render it impossible. It would have been wiser, maybe, as it would have been more consonant with a rite of simple character, to avoid the Eucharistic Preface type of Blessing, and to devote the few lines of dialogue and exordium thus saved to an ordinary prayer, less condensed and questionable in its terms.

After so much unfavourable criticism, the reader will be relieved to learn that *The Baptism* is entirely free from defect. The baptismal usage of *York* is that of the Prayer Book. Relief, however, is merely momentary. What follows the baptismal act evokes surprise and protest.

The caption, *The Reception*, appears to indicate a liturgical act distinct from the baptismal. At once the query poses itself, Reception into what? If it be answered, Into Christ's Catholic Church, theologians Catholic and Protestant, Eastern and Western, will unite in replying, Reception into the Church is effected by Baptism itself, and no further act is necessary. If, on the other hand, it is answered, Reception into the local church or congregation, it will be found difficult to reconcile the broad terms of the declaration, "We receive this child", etc., with the limited interpretation. Such a representative authority on the Prayer Book as Thomas Comber ranks the declaration as an element of "the Administration of Baptism", and thus comments upon it, "Having thus baptized it as Christ appointed, we first declare the child is a Christian, and a Member of the Church, into which holy society the Minister (as a Steward of God's Family) doth solemnly receive it, (and of old this was done with a kiss of Charity:) And for the clearer manifestation that this Child now belongs to Christ, we set his Sign and peculiar Mark upon it."[2] So

[1] *Y.J.C.*, October 1945, Appendix p. xxiv.

[2] See *Short Discourses upon the whole Common Prayer*, London, 1684, p. 345 f. The work is dedicated to Princess (afterwards Queen) Anne, whose chaplain Comber was at the time of writing.

far from being an innovator, Comber is following in the path of his seniors.[1] Had the committee taken care to consult the older authorities on the Prayer Book, the error of *The Reception* need not have been perpetrated. Yet worse is still to come. After the declaration, the minister is directed to pronounce a blessing upon the child, "still holding it in his arms, or by the hand". The blessing must be quoted,

> N., the Lord take thee into his holy household, clothe thee with the robe of innocency, write thy name in the book of life, and keep and govern thee evermore. *Amen.*

The greater part of this blessing is taken over (with some verbal change) from the *Publike Baptism* of 1549, "The Lorde vouchsafe to receyve you into his holy houshold, and to kepe and governe you alwaye in the same, that you may have everlasting lyfe." It will be observed that, in balance for the removal of the final clause of 1549, two extraneous clauses, of oriental tincture, have been inserted into the centre of the blessing. It will be observed also that the initial clause repeats the notion of Reception. The formula of 1549 was designed, however, to serve a purpose very different from that to which it is put in *York*. In 1549 it was recited by the priest as he led the child by the hand from the church door or porch (where the first part of the Service was said) into the church itself and toward the font for the baptismal rite proper. It was, in fact, Cranmer's equivalent of a Latin invitation to the catechumen to enter the baptistery for his Baptism.[2] When the blessing was considered in the Lower House of York Convocation, it was agreed, at the instance of the Dean of York, to substitute "preserve in" for "take into".[3] This improvement was rejected by the bishops.[4] *York* may be said, therefore, to contain two Receptions, each of them a blunder.

The post-baptismal prayers, entitled *The Thanksgiving*, with which *York* ends, follow broadly the lines of the Thanksgiving of the Service of 1928. Of the two prayers of 1928, the second has been jettisoned. The first has been submitted to revision: "to give this infant new birth by thine own Spirit" has replaced "to regenerate . . ."; the reference to "adoption" has been omitted; "to graft him into the body of Christ's Church" has been substituted for "to make him a member of thy holy Church"; and for conclusion a new clause has been added, "And to make him an inheritor of thine everlasting kingdom". Further, in order to give the people "more to do", the words "We thank thee, O God" are introduced as an "Answer" after each of the four clauses. The "Nazareth Prayer" is no longer a permissible addition; its use is now ordered, and it has been revised,

[1] E.g. Bps Sanderson and Wren, both of them revisers in 1661: see W. Jacobson, *Fragmentary Illustrations of the History of the Book of Common Prayer*, London, 1874, pp. 34, 87.

[2] *Ingredere in templum Dei, ut habeas vitam acternam et vivas in saecula sacculorum* (Enter the temple of God that thou mayest have eternal life and live for ever). This invitation was preserved in the Baptismal Services of the York and Sarum Manuals.

[3] *Y.J.C.*, October 1950, pp. 119 f. [4] Ibid., May 1951, p. 58.

without improvement, so that the penultimate clause reads, "grant to all who have the care of him wisdom and understanding, grace and faith in thee". The greeting and invitation, "Peace be with you all," "Let us bless the Lord," follow with their Answers. The congregation may be dismissed with a Trinitarian blessing, "The blessing of God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, rest upon you now and always." In this last feature *York* has undoubtedly achieved improvement.

Such, then, is the Revised Service for baptizing infants which the Convocation of York has provided for occasional use. Further criticism of a more detailed kind could have been brought against the Service, but enough has been said to convey a general impression of its quality. That quality is regrettably poor. The hazards through which *York* has passed and the prolonged process of its production are a partial explanation of its failure. At its beginning it was to have been short in form, simple in content, and homely in language. As time went on, these aims were obscured, and *York* became a mere revision of the two Services of 1662 and 1928. In the event, while *York* is somewhat shorter than the Service of 1928, its content is slight rather than simple, and its language at the best undistinguished. Indeed, neither in linguistic artistry nor in liturgical craftsmanship is *York* the equal, let alone the superior, of the Service of 1662, unsatisfactory as that Service is. It will be granted that the methods which a Convocation must pursue in "considering" or revising a Service are not the best calculated to attain perfection. A liturgical debate can assume certain of the aspects of a "free for all", in which "brain wave amendments" (as the Prolocutor of the York Lower House aptly termed them)[1] are accepted without deliberation, and the voice of those who know what they like, but no more, is decisive. Yet when plenary allowance has been made for all such factors as these, they do not account for the essentially disappointing quality of *York*. In commending the committee's work to the Lower House in 1950, the Dean of York spoke of the committee as "making their standards the present service of infant baptism coupled with a careful look at the historic liturgies as they existed to-day, and had existed from the earliest times".[2] It would be interesting to know in what respects the historic liturgies may be supposed to have contributed materially to the making of *York*. Their traces have been well concealed. Something could have been learned, for instance, from the rite of *Apostolic Tradition*; but there is no sign of it having been learned. What was borrowed from the rite of 1549 was misused. Indeed a liturgical student examining *York* is moved to question whether its compilers possessed that specialist knowledge of the history of Baptism as a Christian institution, and of baptismal liturgy, which was requisite for the performance of the task laid upon them. If *York's* compilers possessed the knowledge, they made

[1] *Y.J.C.*, October 1950, p. 76. The then Prolocutor was the Rt Rev. B. Pollard, at the time Archdeacon of Lancaster and now Bishop of Sodor and Man.

[2] Id., p. 72.

no expert use of it. *York*, considered as a liturgy, cannot be counted other than a miscarriage.

What of *York* as an instrument of the Church's baptismal tradition? It will have been remarked that, while the forgiveness of sins or of sin (the simple may wish to inquire what is the difference between the singular and the plural) is not ignored, emphasis falls upon Baptism as the means of reception into the Church and of re-birth. On the other hand, Noah and the Ark, and the deliverance of the chosen people from the Red Sea, with its Paschal associations, have been thrown overboard. The "old Adam", the notion of Baptism as a burial into the Lord's death, leading to a partaking of his resurrection, the idea of God's "adoption" of the baptized child, have all been discarded. If it be claimed that these terms and ideas are beyond the grasp of the simple mind, it can be replied that at least the "old Adam" and "adoption" are respectively a familiar expression of common speech and a familiar institution of contemporary life. Finally, it is singular that, in a modern Service of Baptism, although Baptism of Infants, no allusion should be made to the baptism of the Lord, even in the Blessing of the Water. Although the baptismal tradition of the Church has not disappeared from *York*, it has been made regrettably scanty and thin.

If *York* should be appointed the sole official alternative to the Service of 1662, with the possible prospect of becoming, in course of time, the only rite for baptizing infants, it will be an occasion for lament. Those who know and cherish the baptismal tradition and liturgy of the Church will receive *York* without welcome, and not without dismay.

EDWARD C. RATCLIFF.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. R. S. Barbour is Lecturer in New Testament Language, Literature and Theology at New College, Edinburgh.

The Rev. A. H. Couratin is Principal of St Stephen's House, Oxford.

The Rev. E. C. Ratcliff is Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

THE PROBLEM OF THE BAPTISTERY

SIR,

The problem of the baptistery seems to be made almost insoluble by the dual need for the font to be the focus of attention during the administration of baptism, while at other times, and especially during the Eucharist, it is required to remind us of Holy

Baptism without unduly diverting attention from the altar. The primitive solution of a separate baptistery must be rejected to-day both for practical reasons and because it conflicts with the welcome tendency to treat Baptism and Communion as associated and interdependent acts of fellowship in Christ's Body. (See *Baptism and Confirmation To-day*, pp. 39–40.) Similarly (I speak boldly) Professor Davies' solution is unsatisfactory since it involves the majority of the congregation turning their backs on the altar during Holy Baptism and vice versa.

Is not the answer to abandon the concept of a fixed font? In general it is a cumbersome object which is far too large for its purpose unless a return to total immersion is contemplated. A small movable font could be placed in front of the sanctuary for Holy Baptism; here, with the priest, candidates and sponsors grouped round, it would dominate the church while the presence of the altar in the background would remind one of the forward-looking character of baptism. At other times it could be moved to one side to balance the lectern or pulpit (do we need both?); they would remind one of the different functions of the ministry of the Word of God and the ministry of Holy Baptism in preparing for Holy Communion, but neither would be sufficiently dominant to distract one's attention from the altar during the climax of the communion service.

There is a parallel here with the occasional practice of moving the pulpit to the centre of the church for services consisting exclusively of the ministry of the Word.

This arrangement has two additional advantages. First, in a combined baptism, confirmation and first communion service, as recommended by the Liturgical Commission, the font can be reverently removed after the baptism to reveal the second focus—the bishop's chair—which in its turn gives way to the altar. Second, the font can easily be moved to a side chapel if, for pastoral reasons, a baptism is to be celebrated with only a token congregation.

Yours faithfully,

A. J. Campbell.

37 Salcombe Road,
Newbury,
Berkshire.

THE OFFERTORY PROCESSION

Dear Sir,

May I take up the question of the Pelagian tendency of the Offertory Procession? The Archbishop of York entered the *caveat*, I have often heard it echoed, and Canon Preston has now reinforced it: yet it seems rather a bogey to me.

The danger feared is that we may forget that "we cannot, and we dare not, offer aught of our own apart from the one sacrifice of the Lamb of God". (*Durham Essays and Addresses*, p. 18.) Canon Preston writes that "anything we offer must start from rather than lead up

to the sacrifice of Christ". Now the Anglican rites give great emphasis to the Lord's sacrifice, both by their wording and by the very fact of general communion, which most concretely expresses our dependence on the sacrificed Lord. No Offertory Procession can annul this emphasis; the danger must be that it may weaken it. Such a weakening would, I suppose, tend to Pelagianism; but does it in fact exist? Offertory Processions usually consist of (1) an action, with (2) accompanying words, and usually go with (3) a fairly marked type of teaching: in which of these three can Pelagianism be detected?

(1) The action. For laymen to bring the elements to the altar is no more Pelagian than for a priest to obey the 1662 rubric, and "place upon the Table so much Bread and Wine, as he shall think sufficient", and lay participation is valuable and meaningful. If this act tends to induce Pelagianism in the British heart, its effect will be more than counterbalanced by the later act of the communion. An act of perhaps six representative members of the congregation early on in the service will be quite outweighed by the act of the entire congregation when, after the solemnity of the consecration prayer, they all come to the altar to eat and drink the consecrated elements. Even the chronological priority of the Offertory does not obscure the theological priority of the Communion.

(2) The words. Discussion is made difficult by the great diversity of practice here. Some churches have no words at all, some a single sentence or prayer, some several prayers. The gist of the words is usually to ask God to receive our selves and lives and work in the gifts; and here one does feel dubious, for such words may seriously detract from the force of the oblation proper, later in the service. They may be regarded as merely preliminary, expressing only "taking" for the purpose of the later "offering"; though this is hard to take seriously when there are, e.g. three prayers, one each for bread, wine, and alms. A single Offertory Prayer keeps a better balance, especially when it immediately precedes the Sursum Corda, as in the C.S.I. and Scottish Liturgies, and even more when, as in the Scottish, it says nothing of "offering" and is chiefly praise and blessing. Best of all, at least with the 1662 rite, is surely to have no words at all: then the act can be seen as one of placing on the Table, and not of offering, which is to come later.

(3) The accompanying teaching and practice. As a matter of experience the Archbishop finds these unsatisfactory in Parish Communion churches. One can only plead that they need not be so. I believe that, if a service is sound on the two points above, the whole rite will itself provide enough emphasis on the sacrifice of Christ to outweigh, in the long run, even the deficiencies of "teaching and atmosphere and choice of hymns" (the contaminated areas noted by the Archbishop). But of course one hopes for better teaching. Canon Preston is more specific, and objects to the "stress on the relation of the bread and wine to man's labour" as unscriptural. But whatever the idea's merits (and it is remarkably like St Augustine's celebrated words, "There are *you* upon the table, there are *you* in the chalice"), it is not in itself either Pelagian or un-Pelagian. A

Pelagian could use it, by asserting that man's labour can be offered to God apart from Christ's sacrifice; an Augustinian could use it, by asserting that man's labour must be offered to God in and through Christ's sacrifice.

I conclude that Pelagianism *may* creep in *via* teaching and certain types of Offertory Prayers, but that it need not do so: and that the bare action of an Offertory Procession is not Pelagian at all. The danger of Pelagianism is no greater in an Offertory Procession than it is in any context where man's activity is spoken of, as it must be sometimes.

May I mention a different "hesitation about the Parish Communion" which I sometimes feel, while remaining, like Canon Preston, a supporter? It is the feeling that the Parish Communion movement, in the Church of England at least, tries to impose a Dixian "4-action shape" on a rite which really shows forth the Lord's death in a different way. Which is better, to supplement and fill out the 1662 rite with ceremonies that express a rather different shape, though an older and perhaps better one; or to interpret the 1662 rite with ceremonies that express its peculiar merits? A silent Offertory Procession does the latter: one with an Offertory Prayer tends to do the former. I do not think the 1662 rite incomparable or final; but in churches that use it, is it not a doubtful policy to obscure its special characteristics, and to make congregations, even unknowingly, pray one way and act another?

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

J. H. Davies.

11 Collier Road,
Cambridge.

MUSIC IN WORSHIP

Dear Sir,

Mr Jackson is entitled to the view he expresses in his letter that modern "pop" music is inevitably associated with what is degrading and loathsome. He is less entitled to pour scorn on the aim in liturgy "that all may understand it". This is a cardinal principle of Anglican worship, and one of the reasons why revisions of the liturgy, the psalms and the Bible are all being undertaken at the present time. Nor need it lead to a cheapening of worship; it will increase its genuineness. I agree we must offer our best and I should heartily resist any attempt to destroy the tradition and quality of Anglican Cathedral worship which is the envy of much of Christendom. My contention is that we must offer the common *as well*, and that the Church must impinge upon every level of culture. Hence my modest plea that light music should be given a look-in in ordinary worship.

The really disturbing thing in Mr Jackson's letter is his acquiescence in the gulf between church music and popular secular music. Surely, if the gap between sacred and secular were unbridgeable then Incarnation, Atonement and Sanctification would be meaningless terms.

I would point out that I did not advocate the use of light music on behalf of the younger generation; in fact its appeal cuts across all age groups. When its use in church is resented it is often basically because religion is felt to be invading a sphere of life thought to be outside God's concern. I can, however, assure Mr Jackson that literally thousands in this country, Australia and elsewhere, who have worshipped God with this music, have found it neither degrading nor loathsome, but helpful in bringing their worship alive in church and in relating that worship to their daily life in the world.

Finally, let us keep the place of music in perspective. It may contribute in a small way to people's experience of God and of the Church, but as to solid *permanent* conversions: one is tempted to echo the words of the countryman who was asked if he had lived in the village all his life: "Not yet," was the truthful reply.

Yours faithfully,

PATRICK APPLEFORD.

BISHOPS' COLLEGE,
CHESHUNT, HERTS.

THE ORDINATION OF WOMEN

DEAR SIR,

The example which Mr MacDonald Smith has chosen "in parentheses" seems particularly unfortunate to illustrate his thesis that we have a "revelation" of an "ontological difference" between men and women, which constitutes a theological impediment to the ordination of women.

Mr Smith says that one of the ways in which humans "imitate" God is their rational fecundity, and he continues that this is "a fecundity which women share in by bringing the potential children of God into the world, and which men . . . imitate by . . . the power of spiritual procreation".

But surely, Sir, the fecundity of men is at least as necessary as that of women to the entry of children into the world; whilst the part played by the mother in the spiritual development of the child is as well known to the Church as to the psychologists—or why do we expend so much time and energy upon M.U. and other similar organizations? Rather, men and women, in their joint procreative roles, show that they are required together, at both "physically fecund" and "spiritually fecund" levels, to image forth in human terms the creative activity of God.

We accept by revelation that God is indeed personal, and therefore referred to in Scripture and tradition by the generic "he", not the impersonal "it". But the true interpretation of the Scriptural revelation that "God made man in his own image" is complicated not only by the doctrine of *analogia entis* as propounded by St Thomas Aquinas, but also by the ambiguity of "man's" personal and psychological make-up. It is a demonstrable fact that, while we label individuals male or female according to their *biological* functions, each shows him or herself to be composed of a mixture in

varying proportions of some of each of those characteristics which we label masculine or feminine. May we not suppose that this reflects an analogical masculinity-and-femininity in God himself? Certainly it would seem sounder, in the face of the personality of Jesus Christ, to attribute this wholeness to the Trinity, rather than to talk of God and spiritual procreation in terms of maleness alone. If this be so, talk of the image of God in man is no argument against the ordination of women, but rather the contrary.

Yours sincerely,
BASIL AND RACHEL MOSS.

13 GLENTWORTH ROAD,
BRISTOL 6.

AN ENGLISH COLLEGE OF PREACHERS

DEAR SIR,

May I assure your correspondents that the aim of the College of the College of Preachers is certainly more ambitious than to organize periodic three-day courses at Scargill in Yorkshire. It is to establish a permanent institution in buildings of its own, adequately financed. A beginning, however, has to be modest, but it may interest your readers to know that the two training weeks organized for November are already fully booked up, and arrangements are being worked out for courses in 1961.

Yours faithfully,
D. W. CLEVERLEY FORD.
Director of the College of Preachers.

4 CAMBRIDGE PLACE,
LONDON, W.8.

"A GREAT GOSPEL FOR A GREAT DAY"

DEAR SIR,

In a note about a lecture of mine, your reviewer quotes me to the effect that the theology I want is a "theology of one dead man" (September 1960, p. 388). But I used this phrase to say how Christian theology must appear *to sceptics* (p. 20). Since my lecture was an attempt to state the objectives of the S.C.M. Press, and perhaps more than my own touchiness is involved, I should be grateful if you would allow me to reassure your readers that the Editor of the Press is not an atheist.

Yours faithfully,
DAVID L. EDWARDS.

The reviewer writes: "For any unintended misrepresentation I most sincerely apologize. Had Mr Edwards actually used the word *sceptics*, rather than *honest and concerned people*, I do not think I should have questioned the point. That he himself can see that the Christianity which has a strong humanitarian-liberal bias may lead to a false theology of one dead man is, perhaps, significant. I did not intend to imply that Mr Edwards is an atheist."

BOOK REVIEWS

CHRISTENDOM. By Einar Molland. Mowbrays. 1959. 35s.

To Dr Molland's great book, originally published in Norwegian in 1953, and now redrafted, and with the help of Canon H. E. W. Turner beautifully englished (admirers of Ronnie Knox will approve the phrase), an unreserved welcome must be accorded by all who are in the least interested in the ecumenical picture. There is, so far as I am aware, nothing like it as a lucid, charitable and up-to-date account of the Churches which throughout the world acknowledge Jesus Christ as Lord.

The plan of the book places first the Orthodox and other Eastern Churches. Then follows appropriately the longest chapter in the book on the Roman Catholic Church. Moving away from tradition, we come next to Old Catholics, Irvingites, the Anglican Communion, and then the Church of South India. Then follow the Churches that stem mainly from Luther and Calvin, our own Free Churches, and finally the revivalists and those whose version of the faith has led them to break away entirely from traditional Christianity such as Swedenborgians, Darbyites and Quakers. Part II is concerned with systems not specifically Christian but containing derivative elements, such as Unitarianism, Christian Science, Mormonism (Mark Twain described the Book of Mormon as "chloroform in print"!), and Jehovah's witnesses, a modern Gnosticism. The conclusion is concerned with Reunion and the Ecumenical approaches of this century.

His account of Roman Catholicism is sympathetically done. Rome has a system of worship which appeals to all the five senses: symbolic actions abound, and these reach their climax in the drama of the Holy Week ceremonies. Ritualism brings about liturgical uniformity, and the Latin imparts an atmosphere of timeless eternity. Non-Roman Christians will find here a reasoned exposition of much that they have either misunderstood or been quite ignorant of, for instance purgatory, indulgences, invocation of saints, and canonization. But perhaps the most valuable section of all is that in which contemporary developments are reviewed, such as Neo-Thomism, "the new theology" with the warning note sounded in *Humani generis*, the resurgence of biblical scholarship, the Liturgical Movement, worker priests and intensified Mariolatry. Would that there were space here to represent more worthily his wise judgments on these developments!

If Dr Molland's knowledge and appreciation of the Anglican Reformation are typical, then this is indeed not only a good book, but a great one. He has by apt quotation from Anglican divines done justice to both the Catholic and the Protestant strands perpetually to be found within the web of the Church of England, which he terms "the most elastic Church in Christendom". "If the Orthodox Church is 'the Church of Easter', or the Lutheran 'the

Church of Good Friday', the Anglican Church may be described as 'the Church of Christmas'."

There is about the account of each separate Church a succinctness, a relevance and an economy that make the whole exciting reading. In European Lutheranism the pressing problem is to work out the true nature of establishment and to clarify relations with the secular State. This problem has driven Lutheran Churches to a more active concern in social justice. Democratization of society is leading towards a greater measure of elective government of the Church. There is new vitality shown in a number of directions. If there is a criticism to be made, it is that Dr Molland has concentrated in his account of Lutheranism on the Churches of Europe to the neglect of their off-shoots established in America where the entirely different historical circumstances have led to different growth and developments.

The second half of the book has of necessity to be concerned with what the ecclesiastical snob, but not Dr Molland, might call "splinter groups"—those who often rightly have felt called to emphasize a facet of the Church's work and teaching that was being neglected by the existing Church. To us Count Zinzendorf may seem an opinionated eccentric, but the Moravian brethren have played a part out of all proportion to their modest numbers. The Reformed Church with its rigid attitude to Scripture has tended to be divisive: the deep differences between Lutheranism and Calvinism are well drawn out, and a good account given of Presbyterian Church Order.

This is a wonderful conspectus: it is very well documented and contains an excellent bibliography. The sole omission noticed is of the Christadelphians: there is one serious misprint on p. 27. Otherwise it would be very hard to improve upon this most timely book.

Ronald Lunt.

King Edward's School,
Birmingham.

The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship. By Aileen Guilding. Clarendon Press: Oxford University Press. 1960. 30s.

The Sacred Bridge. By Eric Werner. Dobson. 1959. 90s.

Dr Guilding's thesis is that the pattern of the Fourth Gospel follows that of the triennial cycle of synagogue lections. The first part of her book seeks to show that this system was already established in Palestine by the first century. The second part deals with the Fourth Gospel itself, of which chapters 1–4 have "been carefully arranged on the basis of the promise in Acts 1. 8". Chapters 5–12 represent an arrangement of the material to fit the cycle of lections beginning at Nisan. An unnamed feast, the Passover, Tabernacles, and the Dedication are indicated by John himself. Dr Guilding transposes chapters 5 and 6, identifies the unnamed feast with the New Year (not Passover—nor Tabernacles, as urged by Stauffer) and finds that the lections for the last sabbath in Tishri or the first in Cheshvan fit the Man Born Blind, while those for the first sabbath

in Shebat fit the Raising of Lazarus. Chapters 13–20 repeat the themes of 5–12, expanding their references to the Church. Pentecost is left over till chapter 21. Even the *Pericope Adulterae* fits into the scheme, having been added by one who understood the evangelist's intention. Traces are also found of the use of a cycle of lessons beginning at Tishri.

On this basis Dr Guilding produces some striking parallels to the Johannine language, though even then some tailoring is necessary to make the patterns fit: e.g. the lections which match chapter 6 are not those from *before* Passover (so John 6. 4), but from *after* it—end of Nisan or beginning of Iyyar.

This is a book of learned and painstaking scholarship which deserves careful study. Its most difficult feature is perhaps the procedure whereby John is made to confuse historical facts with "facts" which the Father himself vouches for *in the lections of the synagogue*. The latter include the 153 fishes, the stone jars, the name Ephraim, and the name Malchus (from the Hebrew *malko*=his king, in Zech. 11. 6). Dr Guilding tries to save John's historical veracity by suggesting that he may have recalled the actual sermons preached by our Lord at the feasts. But the synoptists also appear to have lectionary tendencies: if then, e.g. some of the details of the Johannine crucifixion scene could have been derived from the Book of Esther, might not the similar details—robe, crown, crucifixion itself —in the synoptists have no further basis?

The likeness of the Esther account to that of the crucifixion had not escaped the Jews, who played it up in the interests of their national heroine. This suggests a possibility with which Dr Guilding does not deal, but which is raised by Professor Eric Werner in his massive work on the relation between Jewish and Christian worship. He finds justified Ludwig Venetianer's theory that the Haftara (prophetic) lectionary system owes its arrangement to the anti-Christian endeavours of Jewish apologists during the first two or even three centuries of Christianity. But he corroborates the close connexion between the Pentateuch readings in church and synagogue. His book is, however, concerned with much more than this, and covers such a wide field as comparison of the liturgies, the origin of the antique musical modes, the music of the various churches of Christendom and of Jewish history, and the question of aesthetic appreciation in the Bible and early Christian era. Large as the book is, it is scarcely large enough to deal fully with all its subjects, but Professor Werner handles each with a sure touch, and in the course of a judicious and fair appraisal is able to convict such scholars as Bousset and Baumstark of elementary ignorance even of the Authorized (Jewish) Prayer Book. The whole investigation is carried up to the tenth century, and back through the synagogue even to early Mesopotamian influence upon liturgical, calendrical and musical patterns. One notes here and there a curious remoteness, as when Pseudo-Origen (who is Hippolytus) is spoken of where modern scholars tend to say Pseudo-Hippolytus, or when a note on Matt. 6. 13 ("for thine is the kingdom", etc.) states that "recently, however, the passage has been

considered spurious by several (*sic*) scholars", or when it is said that when Justin Martyr wrote "John was probably not even written yet". "Lord, come *ye*" is an odd translation of *Maranatha*. But this is an important work, and is rendered the more useful by the incorporation of detailed indices.

E. M. Sidebottom.

The Vicarage,
Hart,
Near West Hartlepool.

Is Death the End? By Carroll E. Simcox. S.P.C.K. 1960. 4s. 6d.

The World to Come. By R. W. Gleason, S.J. Sheed and Ward. 1959. 12s. 6d.

A contrast in styles, but a refreshing unanimity of emphasis. Both books are firmly based on scripture; neither book makes any apology for its presuppositions. Those of Dr Simcox are purely biblical: Fr Gleason makes effective use of the fathers, and of the more formal categories of Rome: Dr Simcox brings out the sense of the teaching of the New Testament, and he argues from his premisses: Fr Gleason is not arguing—he is telling us: both are refreshingly vigorous and uncompromising: Dr Simcox says, "Take it or leave it": Fr Gleason is simply teaching the catholic faith.

Dr Simcox's book will be the more useful for parish priests who take padre's hours or run discussion groups. Fr Gleason's will better serve those who discuss religion on a more academic level: his language is sometimes a little tiresome to us on this side of the Atlantic, especially in the opening and closing chapters—e.g. such an unmelodious and surely unnecessary word as "salvific": but his chapter on *Sin* is an excellent rejoinder to the humanists (whether he intended it as such or not), who are guilty of "the ancient prevarication of Adam and Eve, who would have liked to become a moral law unto themselves" (p. 33): "sin is death pretending to be life" (p. 35)—a remark worthy of George MacDonald. The chapters on *Death* and *Hell*, both previously published, are excellent and lively reading: the chapter on purgatory (*Redemptive Suffering*) is equally good, both in its summary of the history of the doctrine and in its sane interpretation of it. He has some good things to say about *Resurrection* and *Heaven* (the two last chapters), but in these and in the two beginning chapters his language and phraseology are less happy.

Dr Simcox is at his best on death, judgment, hell and heaven. "We depart from this life with our faces turned toward Christ or away from him . . ." (p. 49)—"the way of hell, the way of living by the principle 'I am my own', is the way to the death of that joy for which we are made . . . But . . . a person might have a taste for hell rather than for heaven . . . He may never know what he is missing" (p. 57). There is "no religion in heaven. For the purpose of true religion is to bring us *to* God, *toward* God; in heaven we shall have God" (p. 75).

These are two wholesome books. There are a few minor corrections which might be made. The king of Northumbria was Edwin, not Edward, and it was an Anglo-Saxon kingdom, not British (Simcox, pp. 1 and 2). Hallucinations can arise from an unrealized and subconscious expectation; while not a supporter of the hallucination theory of the resurrection appearances, I would not agree that none of the necessary conditions were present (p. 31). There are better arguments for debunking the debunkers. Are we sure that death is a "chance encounter" (Gleason, p. 46)? Is there "no evidence whatsoever" of preoccupation with the subject of death in the Old Testament? Hezekiah, Job, Ecclesiastes, the Psalms? (p. 48). Was the subject not avoided mainly because it was not a good thing to think about it? In fact it was *tabu*. Is *ruah* the "soul-plus-body" (p. 49), which is inconceivable apart from body? Is not that truer of *nephesh*? But these are minute and unimportant points, in a popular and good book—Dr Simcox's—and a less popular and more theological work—Fr Gleason's—both of which are welcome.

H. A. Blair.

Truro.

SHORTER NOTICES

Our Lady in the Liturgy. By Dom E. Flicoteaux, O.S.B. Challoner Publications. 1959. 7s. 6d.

This book is a devotional commentary on the liturgical texts and the sequence of the feasts of our Lady in the Mass and Office of the Roman Liturgy, with reference to the date and circumstances of their origin. The purpose of the book is to encourage devotion to the Blessed Virgin growing out of the liturgy, "nourished by the Church's own prayer". It is written to discourage the tendency which the author quotes in the words of M. Laurentin, "to cut the Blessed Virgin off from those theological realities in the midst of which she resides". In this connexion the author deplores the modern tendency to portray the Blessed Mother without her Son, because such loses clarity of theological meaning: "The mysteries of Mary are the mysteries of Jesus and her glory is the reflection of his glory."

It is happy to discover such attention to sources in a book on the Virgin from the press of the Roman Communion. The passage on the feast of the Assumption illustrates this, as also the way the author has resisted the temptation to perpetuate the pious belief that our Lord appeared to Mary immediately after his resurrection. The sanity of the book is, however, impaired by the passages on the influence of Mary upon the unborn John Baptist. These are without foundation either in liturgy or scripture. There are several errors in proof reading, on pages 41, 59, 92 and 97.

G. H. Walden.

Sixteenth Century Glass in York Minster and in the Church of St Michael-le-Belfry. By E. Milner-White. St Anthony's Press. York. 1960. 3s. 6d.

For eighteen years the re-ordering, deciphering and re-insertion of the tremendous glass of York Minster have gone on at the hands of an exceptional team of glaziers enthused and directed by the acknowledged authority of the Dean himself. It is one of the major aesthetic achievements of our time, and clearly providential. The Pilgrim Trust alone, recognizing this, has given £1,500 a year for the last fifteen years to the work and will continue to do so for three years more, which will probably see this vast reclamation completed. That is but a part of the superlatively rewarding expenditure involved.

In its latest phases the excitement of new discovery might have been expected to subside; instead of which, more fascinating than a detective story, a quantity of notable sixteenth-century panels has been recovered from a largely meaningless jumble of pieces, and linked, through St Michael-le-Belfry, with the vanished church of St Wilfred, destroyed soon after 1547. Not only is a valuable reappraisal of this too readily slighted period made possible thereby, but the name of the probable craftsman of the great Rose Window of the Minister, which curiously enough has never before been dated or attributed, emerges as John Almayn (i.e. the German). Most likely born and taught in the Rhineland, but with a reputation already founded by his share in the famous Fairford glass, this impressive window appears as his first commission in York, *circa* 1508! So illuminating a monograph would enthrall even those uninterested in glass.

John H. L. Waterson.

Stoke D'Abernon.

A Monastery in Moray. By P. F. Anson. S.P.C.K. 1959. 30s.

In this book, Mr Anson has traced the history of Pluscarden Priory from its foundation in the thirteenth century down to the present day. As in his other books, he unites a careful eye for accuracy with a vivid descriptive power, and one of the most interesting chapters is that in which he describes the daily life of the monks when they kept the Valliscaulian Observance, a variant of the Cistercian reform. He is admirably frank in his account of conditions in the later medieval period, and objective in his description of the Reformation century. The book concludes with the return of the monastic life to Pluscarden, with the arrival of a group of monks from Prinknash in 1948.

While underlining the essential identity between modern and medieval forms of the monastic life, Mr Anson does not hesitate to point out the totally different conditions under which that life must be lived to-day. Without putting the question explicitly, he seems to be asking, how far is it right to think of monasticism merely as a

restoration of something which has disappeared, "a wonderful re-creation of the medieval world"? Is the attempt to rebuild the shell of a medieval monastery not somehow artificial and wasteful? If there are to be magnificent new buildings, would it not be better to employ the best of modern architectural techniques? And is it not only too easy to smother the life of the community, itself vowed to poverty, under the splendour of its outward expression?

These are all questions as relevant to Anglican as to Roman Catholic religious communities, and are some of the reflections aroused by this book which, because it is truthful, can also be disconcerting.

Pusey House, Oxford. A. M. Allchin.

The Social Pattern of the Christian Groups in the First Century. By E. A. Judge. Tyndale Press. 1960. 5s.

The Living World of the New Testament. By Howard Clark Kee and Franklin W. Young. Darton, Longman and Todd. 1960. 25s.

The Apostolic Defence of the Gospel. By F. F. Bruce. Inter-Varsity Fellowship. 1959. 3s. 6d.

Son and Saviour. By A. Gelin *et al.* Translated by Anthony Wheaton. Chapman. 1960. 12s. 6d.

Plenty has been written about the religious background of the New Testament; its political and social background is less familiar to theologians. We need to remedy this if we are properly to evaluate New Testament ideas about society. Unfortunately, most contemporary non-biblical material is too Roman in slant, so that the New Testament has to be taken as its own source of "background". In his stimulating short book, E. A. Judge has attempted this. What sort of things does he tell us? First-century Christianity was "socially well-backed" and left the peasantry and slaves "largely untouched" (pp. 60 f.) though it is an anachronism to see contemporary society as class-stratified (p. iii). The Jerusalem Church, like many another spontaneous association, conducted its business through a board of management and an assembly of members with a senior advisory council (p. 46). An Aramaic backwater is not the main stream of Hellenistic life, and Jesus' social teaching has been refracted through the community for which it was collected (p. 10). We may not always agree; but here is material to inform our judgments. No index, nor page-numbers in footnotes. A.V. Bible quoted throughout.

The title of Messrs Kee and Young's book and its appearance (500 glossy pages, 56 illustrations and 13 maps, all for 25s.) announce another non-specialist book on the New Testament and its background. The authors very properly approach the New Testament via the Church and the life of Jesus via those who proclaimed it. It is good to see transatlantic Protestantism emphasizing the importance of the community, though the Church is still (p. 350), even

in Ephesians, only the visible symbol of the unity of all things in Christ, and not his very body. The Eucharist (pp. 50, 260) is purely commemorative and symbolical.

The book first appeared in the U.S.A. in 1957 and betrays its origin by occasional lapses of spelling (pp. 30, 95, 154) and the use of words like "factionalism" and "to firm up" (pp. 308, 349), but I hope that neither in America nor here should a sentence end with the phrase "the freedom that Paul had preached to them about" (p. 231). The bibliography leans heavily on the *Interpreter's Bible* and a footnote (p. 366), referring to a book published by "Fathers of the Church, Inc.", conjures up a delightfully bizarre picture.

The style is often that of the encyclopedia article, and it is sometimes hard to see wood for trees. Details should be accepted cautiously; limited space means that questionable statements have often to go unqualified. For instance, was I Peter written about A.D. 95 as a counter-attack on the anti-Roman violence of Revelation (pp. 434 ff.)? Was Paul's Christology only incidental prolegomena to the practical ethics of his Epistles (p. 281)? Does the Book of Daniel mention inter-stellar space (p. 57)? Was the Synod of Jamnia a formal meeting of rabbis convened specifically to establish a canon of Scripture (p. 322)? There is a danger in concentrating on the externals of the Synoptics and Acts, tending to see them too much as merely historical sources, not stressing the theological purpose of each book considered as a whole, and the reasons behind their particular selections of events. The book is not entirely successful in its aim of helping us to understand the faith which provided the dynamic for the early Church. It all sounds too dull, respectable and intellectual; it would never have turned the world upside down.

Professor Bruce's little book is more alive, as we can see, e.g. by comparing his précis of Hebrews (pp. 81–4) with that in Kee and Young (pp. 417–32). The second century is known as the "Age of the Apologists", but they only followed the lines laid down in the New Testament. The Gospel confronts Judaism, pagan philosophy, popular idolatry, calumnies of sedition, multiform gnosticisms, Docetism, and religious syncretism; and it works out its positive content in reaction to inadequate or false teaching. Each of Professor Bruce's chapters closes with a few words on the present-day relevance of the aspect of New Testament apologetic under consideration. Would there were more of this—our problems may be illuminated through Biblical parallels, but we need help before we can extract the relevant principles and re-apply them to to-day's situations.

Since *Divino Afflante Spiritu* in 1943, there has been a spate of Roman Catholic books on the Bible. The symposium *Son and Saviour* is a welcome addition. Its subtitle, "The Divinity of Jesus Christ in the Scriptures" explains its purpose. There are contributions on the Old Testament, the Apostolic Church, the Synoptic Gospels, Paul and the fourth Evangelist. The tone throughout is careful and scholarly, and it is realized that Christ's divinity is more often implicit than explicit in the New Testament. All the same, there is the feeling in places that the writers are trying to read later

doctrine into the Bible rather than New Testament theology out of it. For instance, did Jesus himself ever overtly "make a claim to be God"? (p. 8—but p. 68 is more cautious). The translator, whose style is occasionally far from smooth, has invented a word "explicitate" on p. 38, has "illusion" for "allusion" on p. 107, and "ingenuously" for "ingeniously" on p. 112. There are misprints on pp. 29, l. 10; 94, l. 19; and 124 end, and the numbering of footnotes on pp. 73 f. has gone awry. There is no index.

MICHAEL C. PERRY.

WALTON-ON-THE-HILL,
STAFFORD.

FATHERS OF THE KIRK. Edited by Ronald Selby Wright. Oxford University Press. 1960. 21s.

". . . how men who love to live obscurely and in the shadow, are brought to light . . . how men that love quietness are made to stir and to have a hand in public business . . . and generally, how men are brought to act the things which they never determined, nor so much as dreamed of." So wrote Alexander Henderson, reflecting on his own career in the seventeenth century, and so might have written more than one of the twenty-two other clerics whose lives are briefly here recorded for the ordinary Church member. The contributions are scholarly but very readable, and provide an excellent introduction to the byways as well as the highways of Scottish Church history. Both the Old Kirk and the Free Kirk are represented; and such diverse "Fathers" as Ebenezer Erskine and "Jupiter" Carlyle can meet here on equal terms. The profits are to be devoted to the work of church extension.

IAN CLARK.

EDINBURGH.

BOOK NOTES

It is likely that in the coming years a good deal will be written about Father Teilhard de Chardin in view of the interest that has been aroused by his book *The Phenomenon of Man* (see THEOLOGY, February 1960, pp. 80 ff.). There is already available an English translation of Nicolas Corte's *Pierre Teilhard de Chardin: his life and spirit* (Barrie and Rockliff, 15s.). The book itself will serve as an introduction but it is a bit scrappy, and the best part of it is the preface that is contributed by the translator, Father Martin Jarrett-Kerr, C.R., who explains why he regards Teilhard as important "in the English philosophical-theological scene". We are happy to announce that *Saints in Politics: the "Clapham Sect" and the Growth of Freedom* (Allen and Unwin, 21s.) is again in print. It was reviewed by Canon Charles Smyth in THEOLOGY, November 1953, pp. 428 ff.

PRINTED IN BREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON